

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *SIGANUS* FORSSKÅL,
1775. Z.N.(S.) 1721
(see volume 25, pages 26-28)

By M. M. Smith (Department of Ichthyology, Rhodes University, Grahamstown,
South Africa)

The authors state that the purpose of the present application is to validate the use of the alleged generic name *Siganus* Forsskål, 1775. However they have gone further and seek formal recognition of the genus *Scarus* Forsskål, 1775. This latter is an important case *per se* and should perhaps be treated separately.

I fully agree with paragraphs 9 sections 1a, b, 2a, 3a and 4 which validate the generic name *Siganus* Forsskål, 1775, type-genus of family Siganidae, and designate *Scarus rivulatus* Forsskål, 1775, as the type-species.

However with regard to the choice of the type-species of *Scarus*, may I draw the attention of the International Commission to the following:

For many years tropical Parrotfishes were placed in the family Callyodontidae, type genus *Callyodon* Gronow, 1763. *Scarus* Forsskål, 1775 was preoccupied by *Scarus* Gronow, 1763 for a labrid fish until Opinion 261 published on 10th August, 1954 rejecting all the names published in Gronow's "Zoophylacium gronovianum" (1763) validated *Scarus* Forsskål, 1775.

However, the choice of *S. psittacus* Forsskål, 1775 as the type-species is an unfortunate one. It was originally selected by Jordan and Gilbert (1882), possibly because Günther (1862 : 223) indicated it as a widespread, abundant species by synonymizing it with *pyrrhostethus* Richardson, 1845 now regarded as a synonym of *ghobban*. Günther was apparently influenced by Rüppell's figure (1828 : Pl. 20) of *psittacus* which is obviously *ghobban*, but Rüppell's description on p. 77 indicates confusion of species.

Forsskål apparently described his fishes from fresh material. The first true parrotfish on his list is *ghobban* which is an unmistakable fish, easily differentiated from all other species, the characteristic colour alone being remarkably constant. Not only is Forsskål unlikely to have described this species again as *psittacus*, but his description (copied in part by Rüppell) does not fit *ghobban*. The latter species for example does not possess the "1, 2 or 3 conical upper canines".

Klunzinger (1871 : 564) rejects the decisions of Rüppell and Günther, synonymizing *psittacus* Forsskål with *forskali* Klunzinger, the latter found to be *bataviensis* Bleeker, 1857 by Smith (1959 : 268).

Schultz (1958 : 13, 29, 50) synonymizes *psittacus* Forsskål, 1775 with *harid* Forsskål, 1775. Here again it is inconceivable that Forsskål could have described his *harid* under two different names as the Red Sea *harid* has a characteristic, easily recognizable shape and colour, and stands out from all other parrotfishes. Also the specimens which Schultz described as *harid* were not the Red Sea species, but a related one which Smith (1959 : 277) renamed *schultzi*.

These conflicting opinions about the identity of *psittacus* Forsskål, the type-specimen of which no longer exists, emphasize that the original description lacks sufficient data to determine with any certainty what species it really was. The three suggested: *ghobban*, *harid* and *bataviensis* are now recognized as falling into three different genera, so the identity of the type-species is important not only in relation to its own genus.

Scarus psittacus as shown above, and more fully by Smith (1959 : 266-267), can thus only be regarded as a *nomen dubium*, and as such totally unsuitable to be validated.

I recommend therefore that *ghobban*, the first parrotfish (as now accepted) listed by Forsskål, be designated as the type-species of *Scarus*. It is a wide-ranging, unmistakable species, the fish apparently intended by Jordan and Gilbert as the type-species.

I suggest the following emendations:

paragraph 9, section 1 add: (c) to set aside all type designations and selections for the genus *Scarus* Forsskål, 1775, made prior to the Ruling now asked for; and having done so

(d) to designate as the type-species of that genus the species *Scarus ghobban* Forsskål, 1775.

Delete section 2b and replace by:

(b) *Scarus* Forsskål, 1775 (gender: masculine), type-species *Scarus ghobban* Forsskål, 1775.

Delete section 3b and replace by:

(b) *ghobban* Forsskål, 1775, as published in the binomen *Scarus ghobban* (type-species of *Scarus* Forsskål, 1775).

REFERENCES

- BLEEKER, P. 1857. Descriptiones specierum piscium javanensium novarum vel minus cognitarum diagnosticae. *Nat. Tijdschr. Ned.-Indië*, **13** : 323-368
- FORSSKÅL, P. 1775. *Descriptiones Animalium* ... Havniae : 1-164
- GRONOW, L. T. 1763. *Zoophylacii Gronoviani* ... Lugduni Batavorum, pls. fol.
- GÜNTHER, A. K. L. G. 1862. *Catalogue of the Fishes in the British Museum*, **4** : xxi + 534, London
- JORDAN, D. S., and GILBERT, C. H. 1882. A synopsis of the fishes of North America. *Bull. U.S. natn. Mus.* (1883), **16** : 1-1018
- KLUNZINGER, C. 1871. Synopsis der fische des Rothen Meeres, II. *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien*, **21** : 441-668
- RICHARDSON, J. 1845. Report on the ichthyology of the seas of China and Japan. *Rep. Br. Ass. Advmt. Sci.*, 15 meet. : 187-320
- RÜPPEL, W. P. E. S. 1826-1828. *Atlas zu der Reise im Nördlichen Afrika*. Zoologie. Fische des Rothen Meeres. Frankfurt-a-M. : 1-144, 35 pls.
- SCHULTZ, L. P. 1958. Review of the parrotfishes family Scaridae. *Bull. U.S. natn. Mus.*, (214) : v + 143, 31 figs., 27 pls.
- SMITH, J. L. B. 1959. The identity of *Scarus gibbus* Rüppell, 1828 and of other parrotfishes of the family Callyodontidae from the Red Sea and the Western Indian Ocean. *Ichthyol. Bull. Rhodes Univ.*, (16) : 265-281, 5 pls.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED RULING ON THE INTERPRETATION OF *ANOMIA PECTEN* LINNAEUS, 1758. Z.N.(S.) 1832

(see volume 25, pages 50-51)

By Anthony Wright (*Department of Geology, The Queen's University of Belfast, N. Ireland*)

As one whose scientific research is principally concerned with a study of the phylum Brachiopoda, and in particular with the Ashgillian Brachiopoda, I wish to lend my support to the application of Dr. Jan Bergström of Lund University, that the ruling of Opinion 224 applying the specific name "*pecten*" to Dalman's 1828 plate 1, figs. 6a-d, be set aside in view of Bergström's demonstration that Dalman's material is from the Upper Ordovician of Västergötland, whilst Linnaeus' specimen appears to be from the Silurian of Gotland.

The specimen from the Linnean Collection must clearly be the type in view of the fact that the I.C.Z.N. has already decided that the species described by Lister and referred to by Linnaeus is to be regarded as the lamellibranch *Pterinopecten papyraceus*.